

Dear Peter Irons,

2/11/75

If I can be of any help I'm happy about it. However, I can't begin to keep up with my own work, so I may respond disjointedly. I read your letter of the 9th several hours ago and have not had time to look at the enclosures.

These events and the people of whom I knew have been out of mind so long!

Some time, if and when I catch up on the reading in which I'm too far behind, I'd like to read your thesis. I pointed a young friend toward the European end, beginning with Pritt's work, and he did a thesis that is to be published. He found declassified and unused documents.

Did you know of Debevoise's CIA involvement, with Jaworski, also CIA involved (Anderson fund), in International Confederation of Jurist (from recollection)? I have no way of assessing whether it is relevant, but unless his is a common name in New York City law firms, one guy, quite a channel for CIA money for the foulest of cold War purposes. Part of it came out at the time of the NSA scandals. A reporter friend to whom I turned over leads had some interviews which carried the info a little forward.

I thought Weinstein had won his suit was was being stonewalled.

When his deposition is not secret I'd like to go over it. I will be refiling a suit that has already gone to the Supreme Court and was partly responsible for the amending of the law. To then lying and patriotism are one, as the transcript shows, with Dulles as authority.

I hope you are aware of the possibility of damage to the innocent in the total release of all those files, HUAC's or FBI's. You speak of HUAC's. It is one of the legitimate reasons for withholding. At the same time, letting the FBI types decide what should be withheld on this (perfectly legal) ground is still another license to suppress.

I agree with you on the Microfilm (the name I recall) film. The testimony that it could not have been used out-of-date is phoney from my own if limited experience with old film. I've used it regularly long after expiration date. Can you date it? Not manufacture, use.

I never knew anything secret about "unze. I recall his name only in Bund connection and it is possible there was more than one of that name. I don't know how much I have of those old files because the Hollywood Ten decimated them, returning nothing and using nothing in their defense, the only purpose they came and borrowed I never knew what. If those who would like all of my files as a university archive can ever arrange foundation funding I'll be giving all the older stuff, or what remains, immediately. Lots of native fascist (also non-secret) materials.

If you get to look at vouchers, don't restrict yourself to payroll. Other expense items, especially witness, have been used as covers.

I never knew Doering. We were not on the same level! But I recall that he was not regarded by those I knew as a real fine type. Consistent with your suggestion.

Forget about Dick Gregory's well-intended insanity on those pictures that have been so sadly misused for so many years. Can't be Hunt or Sturgis and all that is said of those pictures otherwise also is false. I've done much work on them simply because they have been so consistently misused at the cost of all credibility. Hunt's training at the time you refer to should have had to do with an assignment to FE and should ~~not~~, given the primitive nature of the area of his assignment, had nothing to do with a need to know anything about tapping or bugging. However, he was and remains a China Lobby type and has specific and tangible connects of a much later period. Bill Buckley.

Resumed 2/12/75 early a.m.

I got to read your very interesting notes. I believe your line of reasoning is solid, very good, but I suggest somewhat simplistic. Maybe it would be better to say you take a more restrictive view than I would and this includes a context that I believe is not inclusive enough.

Here I'd better digress for several explanations. I think I can help you. I am willing to. If you want this I think you'd better understand me and the kind of life I lead and what it means, from never having enough time for anything to constant interruptions some days and no disturbances others. I was interrupted at least six times in reading those few pages, often for long periods, with other matters of importance taking my attention. The last time was before midnight, a reporter who is a stranger and had been told I could help him with some work he is doing in Chicago. This may all sound crazy but I was able to help that reporter and did.

This is conducive to neither concentration nor completion of my own projects. So, for a number of reasons, I tend to be outspoken and often don't take time for diplomatic phrasings. But in directness I do not intend insult.

I won't have time to read and correct this because after I finish writing it there are other things I must do before daylight. Then I'll have to take my wife to work. When I get home there are other things I must do. Thus I won't be able to say all I'd like. Actually, to do this would take a rather long time and I would suggest that sometime when you are in the area, about an hour from either Baltimore or Washington, we might get together. If you want to do this, you can crashpad here in an extra bedroom usually used for storage or there are two decent motels less than 10 minutes away.

Your notes refer to people well known to me and to strangers. Martin Dies? I can't imagine him not having done the Nixon thing with Hiss had he seen the possibility. This means to me that Mandel, Stripling and J.B. Matthews also didn't, aside from the other wild-west types he had like Starnes and "Thomas" for members. This means to me that whatever was later alleged could not have been then even by irresponsibles. I can add details on Dies. Plenty of them, from first-hand experience. He tried to "get" me and I was on a first-name basis with him and Starnes before it was all over. If you would want to do this, I would want a tape to keep for oral histories that the colleges I mentioned are interested in.

You treat Hiss as unique. What was unique was his rank, not the fact. This amounts to taking it out of context. The same thing happened to me years earlier, with nine others, some total strangers. Aside from rank there was one major difference: I knew how to fight and did. I had to whip the others, all intellectual types, into a willingness first for they wanted to run and not fight.

I intend this to suggest a broader context for the fact and for the possible inspirations. China Lobby? Sure. But not only them. Or perhaps them used by larger forces. I suggest you think as widely along this line as your facts and imagination permit. There are forces whose interests coincided who had interest in what the Hiss case did to the country and to national policy. Some might easily have been more sophisticated than the former Communists and the legislative wild men and the Kohlberg crew (where I can also tell you what might not be relevant but I think would be interesting). You do not mention J. Edgar Hoover once. I can't conceive that he was not in some way involved. Nor do you mention any element of the Military or their associates in industry. Nor any kind of spooks. The Diering types and their successors. They did some pretty insane things of which I knew, all consistent with what the Hiss case represents. They had more aggressive intent than is generally appreciated.

I don't now have time to try to organize these thoughts and suggestions. I did make marks that can later mean something to me on your notes and I'll add a few comments here.

I have made no special study of ~~Isaac~~ Isaac Don Levine but I am sure he operated on a wider scale than you indicate. I think, for example, that he prevented McKay's

publication of my first book and not through Howard Cady, then McKay managing editor and earlier OSS HQ (from those days he recalled some of my work favorably although we had never met). Levine had wider influence and connections, I believe. He was a guru of those types in those days.

You have no reflection of personal feelings or emotions, as how Chambers felt about Hiss, why he hated him so, how he could consent to frame him as he did, knowing it meant ruin. Even reflection of the awareness that Chambers was a psychopath. I can take your reasoning only so far along this line because as I told you there is something I must hold confidential. I am not aware of any effort by anyone (although I assume the FBI did it) to make a real tracing of Chambers' other connections of the crucial period.

Libel law was different in those days. I think this might be a factor.

Your notes do not reflect the periods of time covered by all the papers in question. You mention the Pumpkin Papers and the microfilm only. Are you aware how widespread availability of those papers, all of them or parts, really was? I am not aware of any effort to check the records to see who else had access, by which I mean exercised access. Had them. Records were kept on all classified papers. Far East (FE) papers were available other than through Hiss.

You seem not to be aware of the right-wing power cell then influential in the House Appropriations Committee, centered around one Barger, first name I think Harold. They were blackmailers, political stuff, blackmailing those from whom they wanted what they wanted. This includes Hiss-case type things. I can be explicit and give you a fair amount of detail, first-hand.

There is a Kohlberg foundation. Have you sought to check their files?

Your notes show no awareness of what may or may not figure in this and I'm inclined to believe does, the extent to which the FBI then had the Communist Party penetrated, to the highest levels. And this is one of the contexts in which I think you should read the short Hiss passage in the transcript. I'm sending the book rather than copying those pages in the belief reading the entire transcript, that is the first part, where they deal with the relevant question, may be helpful. If you can pay for it, we have the money Lesar borrowed to pay the printer to repay. An FBI type in CP leadership could have figured in this whole thing.

I guess that one of the things I'm saying is that the Hiss case can't be separated from the period and the forces.. It is not something separate.

To what I said of Chambers' emotions above I should add the nature of his mental illness or character deficiencies, his motive and any factors that could relate to his willingness to do what could be so ruinous to himself. He ran a great risk because he did perjure himself. A different nature to the Hiss defense, an aggressive one rather than a passive, defensive one, could have made the difference, as could fact. Chambers was not immature or unintelligent. He would not, I think, have depended entirely on the power of those for whom he did this dirty work. One consideration is what they could have laid on him. Criminal charges. But is it all?

HUAC and Hoover used each other all the time. They had common interests. Hoover was more able, more subtle, sometimes more responsible.

I've run out of time. I've just noticed that because of the interruptions I have not read all the notes. I'll delay mailing on the chance I can get to them later today. I missed the set with attachments.

I think there is more on John Joseph Frank but don't remember clearly.

P. 4: you may want to project forward from that timeperiod on Lovestone.

P. 5: I should have old files on Smythe but probably not relevant. Perhaps in my recollections I confused the two Kunzes.

Hastily,